



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/819,516      | 03/27/2001  | Yutaka Nagakura      | NEC N00-1101        | 2816             |

7590 03/20/2003

Norman P. Soloway  
HAYES, SOLOWAY, HENNESSEY, GROSSMAN & HAGE, P.C.  
175 Canal Street  
Manchester, NH 03101

EXAMINER

MOORE, KARLA A

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 1763     | 7            |

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/819,516

Applicant(s)

NAGAKURA,  
YUTAKA++++++

Examiner

Karla Moore

Art Unit

1763

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 12 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-19. 

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Examiner disagrees with the contention that the combination of Hattori and Gengler fails to provide motivation for Applicant's invention represented by claims 1-12. As cited in the most recent office action, Hattori is cited for teaching the invention substantially as claimed, including a crescent shaped gas feeder. Gengler is cited for teaching tapering of a gas feeder in order to provide a gas passage reduced in area for equalizing gas flow along the length of a device. Tapering of the gas feeding apparatus in Hattori as taught by Gengler would not further limit the space in the apparatus for holding wafers.

With respect to claims 13-19, Hwang et al. is not relied upon for the features Applicant argues are not present in the apparatus. Hwang et al. is cited for its teachings of maintaining a vessel in an air-tight state during a deposition process.

Examiner also notes that Gengler is in fact analogous art based on the fact that Gengler is concerned with the same problem as the presently claimed invention --emission of gas in substantially equal amounts along an entire length of a gas passage.

*[Signature]*  
BENJAMIN L. UTECH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700